REMARKS

By this amendment, Applicant amends claims 1, 19, 37, 38, 47, 56, 131, 150, 169, 170, 180, and 190. Applicant cancels claims 191-202, without prejudice or disclaimer, to avoid redundancy with claims 1, 19, 37, 38, 47, 56, 131, 150, 169, 170, 180, and 190, respectively. Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10, 12-20, 22-26, 28, 30-40, 42-45, 47-49, 51-54, 56, 131-133, 135-139, 141-152, 154-158, 160-171, 173-178, 180, 181, 183-188, and 190 are pending in this application.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10, 12-20, 22-26, 28, 30-40, 42-45, 47-49, 51-54, 56, 131-133, 135-139, 141-152, 154-158, 160-171, 173-178, 180, 181, 183-188, and 190-202 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,446,040 to Socher et al. ("*Socher et al.*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,029,180 to Murata et al. ("*Murata et al.*").

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10-19, 20, 22-26, 28, 30-40, 42-45, 47-49, 51-54, 56, 131-133, 135-139, 141-152, 154-158, 160-171, 173-178, 180, 181, 183-188, and 190 are allowable over *Socher et al.* for at least the reason that *Socher et al.* does not teach or suggest each and every element of independent claim 1, from which claims 2, 4-8, and 10-18 depend; each and every element of independent claim 19, from which claims 20, 22-26, and 28-36 depend; each and every element of independent claim 37; each and every element of independent claim 38, from which claims 39, 40, and 42-45 depend; each and every element of independent claim 47, from which claims 48, 49, and 51-54 depend; each and every element of independent claim 56; each and every element of independent claim 131, from which claims 132, 133, 135-139, and 141-149 depend; each and every element of independent claim 150, from which claims 151, 152, 154-158, and 160-168 depend; each and every element of independent claim 169; each and

every element of independent claim 170, from which claims 171 and 173-178 depend; each and every element of independent claim 180, from which claims 181 and 183-188 depend; or each and every element of independent claim 190.

Socher et al. teaches "synthesizing speech from a piece of input text 104" by "retrieving the input text 104 entered into a computing system, and transforming the input text 104 based on the semantics 152 of at least one word of the input text 104 to generate a formatted text 108 for speech synthesis" (Abstract).

As acknowledged by the Examiner (Office Action, pg. 6, paragraph 4), *Socher et al.* is silent on the matter of "processing the electronic document by active diffusion," as recited in claims 1, 19, 37, 38, 47, 56, 131, 150, 169, 170, 180, and 190. The Examiner relies on *Murata et al.* to make up for this deficiency. However, *Murata et al.* also fails to teach or suggest "processing the electronic document by active diffusion to form the summary text."

Instead, *Murata et al.* teaches an information presentation apparatus having a memory that "stores first information including at least one part corresponding to second information. The first information is displayed and the user indicates the part corresponding to the second information in the displayed first information. In response to the indication, a summary of the second information is read from a data file and stored in the memory. The summary is displayed in addition to the first information." (Abstract.) "A creater [*sic*] of the HTML file A previously prepares the summary file A to store the summary corresponding to the linked part of the HTML file A" (col. 6, lines 10-13). "In general, the content of the summary is the text data. However, a narration (sound) of the summary ... may be used." (Col. 6, lines 38-42.)

Murata et al. teaches that a creator prepares a summary file. But *Murata et al.* is silent on the matter of "<u>processing</u>" an "electronic document" to form a summary text of the electronic document, as required by claims 1, 19, 37, 38, 47, 56, 131, 150, 169, 170, 180, and 190 (emphasis added).

Moreover, *Murata et al.* does not teach or suggest processing the electronic document by "<u>active diffusion, based on the tag information</u>, to form a summary text of the electronic document" as recited in claims 1, 19, 37, 38, 47, 56, 131, 150, 169, 170, 180, and 190 (emphasis added). The Examiner refers to Figure 8 of *Murata et al.* as allegedly disclosing "active diffusion" (Office Action, pg. 6, paragraph 4). However, Applicant can find no mention of "active diffusion" in Figure 8 or the corresponding text of *Murata et al.* There is also no mention of processing the electronic document to form a summary text "based on ... <u>tag information</u>," as required by these claims (emphasis added). Thus, *Murata et al.* also fails to teach or suggest "processing the electronic document by active diffusion, based on the tag information, to form a summary text of the electronic document," as recited in claims 1, 19, 37, 38, 47, 56, 131, 150, 169, 170, 180, and 190.

Moreover, as acknowledged by the Examiner (Office Action, pg. 3, paragraph 4), *Socher et al.* fails to teach or suggest "selection means for selecting whether ... to read out the summary text of the electronic document," as required by claims 1, 38, 131, and 170. *Murata et al.* does not make up for the deficiencies of *Socher et al.* because *Murata et al.* also fails to teach or suggest "selection means for selecting whether ... to read out the summary text of the electronic document," as recited in claims 1, 38, 131, and 170.

Outputting a summary of the second information in the form of a "narration (sound)," as in *Murata et al.*, does not constitute "read[ing] out the summary <u>text</u> of the electronic document," as recited in claims 1, 38, 131, and 170 (emphasis added). "<u>Reading out</u> a <u>text</u>" refers to <u>text-to-speech synthesis</u>, which involves converting text to speech. In contrast, simply outputting a sound as in *Murata et al.* does not constitute operating on <u>text</u>, and therefore also does not constitute converting text to speech.

Thus, claims 1, 38, 131, and 170 should be allowed over *Socher et al.* and *Murata et al.*

Socher et al. also fails to teach or suggest "selecting whether the speech synthesizer is to read out the summary text of the electronic document," as recited in claims 19 and 37. *Murata et al.* does not make up for the deficiencies of *Socher et al.* because *Murata et al.* fails to teach or suggest "selecting whether the speech synthesizer is to read out the summary text of the electronic document," as recited in claims 19 and 37.

Outputting a sound does not constitute <u>reading out</u> a <u>text</u> by a "<u>speech synthesizer</u>," as required by claims 19 and 37. A device that simply outputs a sound does not constitute a "speech synthesizer," which performs text-to-speech synthesis. Thus, claims 19 and 37 should be allowed over *Socher et al.* and *Murata et al.*

Socher et al. also fails to teach or suggest "a selecting step of selecting whether the summary text of the electronic document is to be read out," as recited in claims 47, 56, 150, 169, 180, and 190. *Murata et al.* does not make up for the deficiencies of *Socher et al.* because *Murata et al.* also fails to teach or suggest "a selecting step of

selecting whether the summary text of the electronic document is to be read out," as recited in claims 47, 56, 150, 169, 180, and 190.

Outputting a sound does not constitute reading out a text, which refers to text-to-speech synthesis. Thus, claims 47, 56, 150, 169, 180, and 190 should be allowed over *Socher et al.* and *Murata et al.*

Thus, since *Socher et al.* and *Murata et al.* fail to teach or suggest, alone or in combination, each and every element of independent claims 1, 19, 37, 38, 47, 56, 131, 150, 169, 170, 180, and 190, claims 1, 2, 4-8, 10, 12-20, 22-26, 28, 30-40, 42-45, 47-49, 51-54, 56, 131-133, 135-139, 141-152, 154-158, 160-171, 173-178, 180, 181, 183-188, and 190 should also be allowed over *Socher et al.* and *Murata et al.*

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to Deposit Account No. 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: August 31, 2006   By:_____

Reece Nienstadt
Reg. No. 52,072